

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ORANGEBURG DIVISION

Theodore J. Bolick,)	Civil Action No.: 5:17-cv-03487-RBH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Wayne Owens, Tom Fox, J. Johnson,)	
and Phillip Thompson,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e) (D.S.C.). *See* ECF No. 13. The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court summarily dismiss Plaintiff’s pro se complaint without prejudice and deny his motion for preliminary injunction. *Id.* at p. 4.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Plaintiff has not filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.¹ In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the

¹ Plaintiff’s objections were due by February 15, 2018. *See* ECF Nos. 13 & 14. On February 26, 2018, the envelope containing the R & R was returned as undeliverable and marked “INMATE NOT IN JAIL.” *See* ECF No. 15.

Magistrate Judge’s recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note)).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error and therefore adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge’s R & R [ECF No. 13]. Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES** Plaintiff’s complaint *without prejudice and without issuance and service of process*. The Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction [ECF No. 3].

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
March 2, 2018

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge